DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 321 SP 011 185

AUTHOR Solliday, Michael A.; Anderson, Kaye
TITLE The University Supervisor: What Place in Academe? Student Teacher Supervisor Questionnaire.
PUB DATE Feb 77
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention, Association of Teacher Educators (57th, Atlanta, Georgia, February 2-5, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Supervisors; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; *Faculty Promotion; Schools of Education; *Teacher Salaries; Teachers Colleges; *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

This study investigated procedures used by certified teacher training institutions to evaluate supervisors of student teaching programs. Three basic questions researched in the project were: (1) How are university supervisors evaluated and by what criteria; (2) Who evaluates university supervisors and how much weight does such evaluation have on salary, promotion, and tenure; (3) How satisfied are student teacher directors with the evaluation procedures used by their institutions? The survey was sent to the directors of student teaching at sixty-five certified teacher training institutions in Illinois, of which forty-nine responded. Compilation of the responses yielded the following information: (1) The most important considerations in evaluation are supervisors' efforts to improve the teacher education program, personal traits, and teaching ability; (2) Department chairmen, and directors of student teaching are most influential in decisions of salary and tenure, while department chairmen and other administrators (deans, vice presidents, presidents) are most influential in matters of promotion; (3) Twenty-three percent of the respondents report that evaluation is based solely on evaluation input from various individuals; twelve percent include personal observation in addition; sixteen percent use observations, conferences, self-evaluation, and informal procedures; twenty percent use "regular faculty evaluation" procedures; and twenty eight percent responded "none" or made no response to the question on evaluation procedures used. Ninety-three percent of the respondents reported satisfaction with their evaluation procedures. (MB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141321

The University Supervisor: What Place In Academe?
Student Teacher Supervisor Questionnaire

Dr. Michael A. Solliday
Professional Education Experiences
Southern Illinois University

and

Mrs. Kaye Anderson
Professional Education Experiences
Southern Illinois University

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP011 165

Prepared for delivery at the 57th Annual Convention of the Association Of Teacher Educators, Hilton Hotel, February 2-5, 1977 Atlanta, Georgia

Abstract

The University Supervisor: What Place in Academe?
Student Teacher Supervisor Questionnaire

As university faculty members, supervisors of student teachers have a role distinct from other university faculty. In 1976 a survey of Illinois teacher education institutions was conducted to determine whether or not this difference was taken into consideration in the procedures used to evaluate supervisors.

From seventy-five percent of the Illinois teacher education institutions it was found that

1. The most important considerations in evaluating supervisors are their efforts to improve the teacher education program, their personal traits, and their teaching ability.

2. Department chairmen and directors of student teaching are the most influential individuals regarding decisions of salary and tenure, while department chairmen and other administrators (deans, vice presidents, president) are the most influential individuals for promoting supervisors.

3. Twenty-three percent of the institutions report that evaluation is based exclusively on evaluation input from various individuals. Twelve percent of the institutions claim their procedures include examining evaluation input plus personal observation of the supervisors. Sixteen percent use conferences with supervisors, observation of supervisors, "self-evaluation", or "informal procedures." Twenty percent of the institutions use "regular faculty evaluation" and twenty- eight percent responded "none" or made no response to this inquiry.

4. Ninety-three percent of the respondents report they are satisfied with their system of evaluating supervisors. The procedures are changed on the average of every two years.

THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR: WHAT PLACE IN ACADEME?

STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

At an early stage in the investigation of the evaluation of university supervision at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, the decision was made to survey other certified teacher training institutions about their student teaching program. Although the survey was designed to obtain information on many aspects of their field experience program, this presentation will be confined to the portion of the questionnaire concerning the evaluation of university supervision.

The three basic questions in this survey were:

1. How are university supervisors evaluated and by what criteria?
2. Who evaluates university supervisors and how much weight does such evaluation have on salary, promotion, and tenure?
3. How satisfied are student teacher directors with the evaluation procedures used by their institutions?

This survey was sent to the director of student teaching at sixty-five certified teacher training institutions in the state of Illinois. Forty-nine surveys were returned (75%), yielding the following information.

Factors Used to Evaluate Supervisors

Most student teaching directors (80%) consider efforts to improve the teacher education program, personal traits, and teaching ability of greatest importance in evaluating university

supervisors. Research and service is also used as evaluation criteria by thirty-five per cent of the responding institutions. It is inferred that these five measures are the most significant factors considered by various institutions, although some additional items were cited. Other criteria offered included experience as a public school teacher, dedication to the field of supervision, community and professional activity, willingness to travel, knowledge of subject matter, the number of visits to student teachers, and the quality of assistance to students.

Influence on Salary, Tenure, and Promotion

Although salary, tenure, and promotion were considered as independent issues on this survey, at many institutions the same individuals exert identical influence in all three areas. Seven categories of people were listed who might influence decisions on the amount of money a supervisor receives, whether or not he is given tenure, and whether or not he is promoted in academic rank. Table 1 summarizes the results by listing those groups of people and the degree of influence they exert (1 = most influence, 8 = least influence) on the salary, tenure, and promotion of the supervisor as independent items and then the relative weight of those groups for all three areas combined.

TABLE 1 INFLUENCE ON SALARY, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS

Evaluators	Salary	Tenure	Promotion	Combined
Student Teachers	3.5	5	6	3.5
Fellow Supervisors	3.5	4	5	5
Other Faculty Members	5	3	4	3.5
Directors of Student Teaching	2	2	3	2
Department Chairmen	1	1	1	1
School Teachers	6	6	7	6
School Administrators	7	7	8	7
Other (Dean, Vice President, President, Academic Departments)	8	8	2	8

The department chairman and director of student teaching were generally considered the most influential people making decisions regarding the professional status of a supervisor. This is particularly true in making decisions regarding their salary and tenure. Central administrators including deans, vice presidents, and presidents and also individuals from other academic departments were extremely influential in decisions of promotion.

Student teachers are accorded a reasonable degree of influence in the evaluation of supervisors, but it would appear that cooperating teachers and public school administrators exhibit little influence.

Satisfaction With the Evaluation Procedures

Various patterns of evaluating supervisors are used by the respondent institutions. Most common are (1) relying on evaluation input of various individuals, (2) the "regular faculty

evaluation procedures," and (3) a combination of observing the supervisor directly and relying on evaluation input. Nearly a third of the respondents did not answer the question or claimed that they had no evaluation procedures. Table 2 depicts the frequency of the various patterns used.

In spite of these results, ninety-three percent of the respondents report that they are satisfied with the system their institution uses to evaluate university supervisors, and no respondent claims their system to be highly unsatisfactory. It should be stressed, however, that the survey was sent to directors of student teaching and it is assumed these people completed and returned the questionnaire. Simply because they report a high degree of satisfaction with their process does not mean that all persons at that institution are satisfied with the procedures.

TABLE 2 PATTERNS OF EVALUATING SUPERVISORS

Patterns	Frequency	Percent
Conferences with supervisors	2	4%
Observations of supervisors	1	2%
Evaluation input	11	23%
Conferences and observations	2	4%
Observations and evaluation input	6	12%
Self-evaluation	1	2%
"Informal procedures"	2	4%
"Regular faculty evaluation"	10	20%
"None"	5	10%
No response	9	18%

Revisions in procedures are reported to be both regular and relatively frequent. The average time for procedures to be modified is twenty-five months.

Implications and Conclusions

Though this survey yields interesting data, the biggest surprise to the researchers is the difficulty most institutions have in describing their evaluation procedures and the high degree of ambiguity existent even when some formal instruments are used. Certainly there is great variance in procedures used, in evaluation instruments developed, and in myriad other considerations at particular institutions which make evaluating supervisors a complex task. Overall, there appears to be a lack of sophistication in evaluating university supervisors. Certainly additional thought must be brought to bear on this whole endeavor.

Many questions need further investigation; among them:

1. Would surveys of other states yield the same results as this Illinois survey?
2. When there is a high degree of divergence regarding supervisors' responsibilities, supervisory load, varying settings and abilities of student teachers, etc. should there be common standards of performance of all supervisors, and how can this be made equitable?
3. What advantages and disadvantages are there for formalized evaluation procedures? for informal evaluation procedures?
4. Is it possible to devise evaluation instruments for university supervisors which authentically reflect their full duties and yet which equate them in status with other faculty in consideration for salary increases, tenure, and promotion in rank.

Hopefully this paper can stimulate discussion at many teacher institutions and that the ensuing dialogue can assist

many concerned professionals to struggle with this very important issue. We would encourage anyone willing to do so to duplicate our study in your state. For additional information please contact

Mike Solliday or Kaye Anderson
Professional Education Experiences
Wham 135
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

(618) 453-2456